International Relations:
Changing Perspectives

From Realism and Liberalism to Constructivism, Post-Colonialism, Feminism, and the Challenges of the Twenty-First Century

Presidency University Kolkata | 2026

Abstract

International Relations as an academic discipline has undergone a series of profound theoretical transformations since its formal founding in the aftermath of the First World War. Beginning with the idealist ambitions of the inter-war period and the subsequent realist challenge that established power, the state, and national interest as the foundational categories of the discipline, IR theory has evolved through a succession of paradigmatic shifts — the liberal institutionalist challenge to realism, the behaviouralist revolution, the neo-neo synthesis of the 1980s, and the successive waves of critical, constructivist, post-structural, feminist, post-colonial, green, and cosmopolitan challenges that have transformed the theoretical landscape of the discipline since the end of the Cold War. Each of these theoretical developments has reflected and engaged with major changes in the character and organisation of world politics: the rise and fall of the bipolar Cold War order; the proliferation of international institutions and regimes; the emergence of transnational actors, global civil society, and non-state threats; the processes of globalisation; the end of the Cold War and the debates about the new world order; the 9/11 attacks and the global war on terrorism; the rise of emerging powers; the climate crisis; the return of great power competition; and the multiple crises of the liberal international order in the second decade of the twenty-first century. This paper provides a comprehensive examination of the changing perspectives in International Relations theory from the discipline's founding moment to the present, analysing the major theoretical traditions and their evolution, the principal debates between them, the critical challenges that have transformed the discipline's theoretical boundaries, and the pressing theoretical and empirical questions that the contemporary world poses for IR scholarship. It argues that the diversity of theoretical perspectives that characterises contemporary IR is not a sign of disciplinary fragmentation but a reflection of the genuine complexity of world politics and the multiple dimensions of the phenomena that IR must seek to understand. Understanding how the field has changed — and why — is itself a form of political literacy essential for any student of world affairs.

Keywords:

International Relations Theory, Realism, Liberalism, Constructivism, Post-Colonialism, Feminism, World Politics, Global Governance, Changing Perspectives, IR Theory

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 5

1.1 The Discipline of International Relations: Origins and Evolution

1.2 The Significance of Changing Perspectives in IR

1.3 Research Objectives and Paper Structure

2. The Idealist Foundation and the Realist Challenge 8

2.1 Inter-War Idealism: Wilsonianism and the Liberal Peace Programme

2.2 Classical Realism: Morgenthau, Power, and the National Interest

2.3 E. H. Carr and the Twenty Years' Crisis

3. Liberal Internationalism and Institutionalism 12

3.1 The Liberal Tradition: Kant to Functionalism

3.2 Interdependence Theory and Neoliberal Institutionalism

3.3 Democratic Peace Theory and Liberal Order-Building

4. The Neo-Neo Debate: Waltz, Keohane, and Structural IR Theory 15

4.1 Neorealism: Waltz and the Logic of Anarchy

4.2 Neoliberal Institutionalism: Cooperation under Anarchy

4.3 The Neo-Neo Synthesis and Its Limits

5. Constructivism and the Social Turn in IR 18

5.1 The Constructivist Challenge: Wendt, Onuf, and Kratochwil

5.2 Norms, Identity, and the Social Construction of International Reality

5.3 Constructivism in Practice: Norms Emergence and the Power of Ideas

6. Critical Theories: Marxism, the Frankfurt School, and World-Systems 21

6.1 Marxist and Neo-Marxist Approaches to World Politics

6.2 Cox's Critical Theory and the World Order Approach

6.3 World-Systems Theory: Wallerstein and Global Capitalism

7. Post-Structuralism, Discourse, and the Linguistic Turn 24

7.1 Derrida, Foucault, and the Deconstruction of IR

7.2 Security Studies and the Widening of the Security Agenda

7.3 The Copenhagen School and Securitisation Theory

8. Feminist International Relations 28

8.1 The Feminist Intervention: Tickner, Enloe, and Gender in IR

8.2 Feminist Security Studies and the Politics of Protection
8.3 Feminist Contributions to IR Theory and Practice
9. Post-Colonial International Relations 31
9.1 The Post-Colonial Challenge to Eurocentric IR
9.2 Fanon, Said, and the Politics of Knowledge in IR
9.3 Non-Western IR Theory and Global IR
10. IR in the Twenty-First Century: New Challenges 34
10.1 Globalisation, Global Governance, and the Liberal Order
10.2 The Rise of China, Multipolarity, and Power Transition
10.3 Climate Change, Pandemics, and Human Security
11. Conclusion 38
References 40

1. Introduction

1.1 The Discipline of International Relations: Origins and Evolution

International Relations emerged as a distinct academic discipline in the aftermath of the First World War — a catastrophe that seemed to demand systematic scholarly inquiry into the causes of war and the conditions of peace. The establishment of the first Chair of International Politics at Aberystwyth in 1919, endowed by David Davies in memory of students killed in the war and expressly dedicated to the prevention of future wars, marked the formal institutional founding of IR as a field of study. This founding moment was simultaneously an intellectual and a political event: the new discipline was shaped by the conviction that the war had been preventable, that its prevention required the scientific understanding of international politics, and that such understanding could contribute to the reform of international relations in the direction of peace, law, and international cooperation.

The subsequent development of the discipline can be read as a series of theoretical revolutions — moments in which the dominant framework of the previous period is challenged, partially rejected, and superseded by a new framework that claims greater explanatory power, greater empirical adequacy, or greater critical insight. The discipline's first "great debate" — between the inter-war idealists and the realists who challenged them in the late 1930s and 1940s — established the foundational categories of IR theory (power, the state, anarchy, national interest, international institutions) and the basic terms of the major theoretical controversies that would shape the field for decades. The second great debate — between the traditionalists and the behaviouralists in the 1960s — concerned the appropriate methodology of the discipline rather than its substantive theoretical content. The third great debate — between neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism in the 1980s — represented the confrontation between two structurally sophisticated but theoretically compatible frameworks that together defined the "neo-neo synthesis." And the fourth great debate — between positivist rationalist approaches and the various critical, constructivist, post-structural, feminist, and post-colonial alternatives that emerged from the 1980s onwards — has transformed the discipline into the theoretically pluralist field that it is today.

Each of these theoretical transformations has been driven by both internal and external pressures: internal pressures arising from the identification of theoretical anomalies, empirical failures, and logical inconsistencies in the dominant framework; and external pressures arising from changes in the character and organisation of world politics that exposed the inadequacy of existing theoretical frameworks and demanded new analytical tools. The end of the Cold War — which most mainstream IR theories failed to predict and which none was well-equipped to explain — was the most dramatic recent demonstration of the discipline's theoretical limitations and the most powerful stimulus to theoretical innovation. The subsequent emergence of constructivism as a mainstream theoretical

approach, the proliferation of critical and post-positivist challenges, and the growing recognition of the need to incorporate non-Western perspectives into IR theory all reflect the discipline's response to the failures of its Cold War theoretical frameworks.

1.2 The Significance of Changing Perspectives in IR

The changing perspectives in IR theory are not merely of academic interest but have profound practical and political implications. Theoretical frameworks shape what policymakers, analysts, and publics see and do not see in world politics — what they count as threats, what they regard as opportunities, what strategies they pursue, and what institutional arrangements they try to build and maintain. Realism's insistence on the primacy of power and the limits of international cooperation has shaped the strategic calculations of statesmen from Bismarck to Kissinger to contemporary advocates of great power competition. Liberalism's belief in the peace-promoting effects of democracy, trade, and international institutions has shaped the foreign policies of the United States and the broader Western alliance since the Second World War. Constructivism's attention to the role of norms and ideas in shaping state behaviour has provided the theoretical framework for much of the analysis of human rights norm diffusion, international humanitarian law, and the responsibility to protect.

Critical theories — Marxist, feminist, post-colonial, and post-structural — have served not only as analytical frameworks but as political interventions: challenges to the power relations, exclusions, and silences that mainstream IR theory has reproduced. Feminist IR has made visible the gendered dimensions of war, security, and international political economy that realism and liberalism systematically ignored. Post-colonial IR has challenged the Eurocentrism of mainstream IR theory and demanded recognition of the perspectives and experiences of the Global South. These critical challenges have not merely added new topics to the IR agenda but have transformed the discipline's self-understanding and broadened the range of voices and perspectives it incorporates.

Understanding the changing perspectives in IR theory is therefore not merely an exercise in intellectual history but a form of critical awareness that enables more reflective engagement with the contemporary world. Students who understand why realism, liberalism, and constructivism see the world differently — and why feminist, post-colonial, and green theorists challenge them all — are better equipped to analyse the complex, contested, and rapidly changing character of twenty-first-century world politics and to resist the temptation of theoretical monocultures that substitute ideological commitment for analytical clarity.

1.3 Research Objectives and Paper Structure

This paper has five research objectives: to trace the intellectual development of IR theory from its founding moment through its major theoretical transformations; to analyse the core theoretical

commitments and empirical claims of the major IR traditions and their evolution; to examine the principal debates between competing theoretical frameworks; to assess the contributions of critical, constructivist, feminist, post-colonial, and other alternative approaches to the theoretical pluralism of contemporary IR; and to evaluate the theoretical challenges posed by twenty-first-century world politics. The paper proceeds through eleven sections addressing these objectives in sequence.

2. The Idealist Foundation and the Realist Challenge

2.1 Inter-War Idealism: Wilsonianism and the Liberal Peace Programme

The founding generation of IR scholars was animated by a shared conviction that the First World War had been the product of a specific and remediable set of failures: the failure of international law and organisation to constrain state aggression; the failure of democratic accountability in the conduct of foreign policy; the failure of free trade to create the economic interdependencies that would make war irrational; and the failure of collective security mechanisms to deter and if necessary punish aggression. This conviction — that war was not an inevitable feature of the international system but a contingent outcome of specific institutional failures that could be remedied through rational reform — defined what later critics would call "idealism" or "utopianism," though the inter-war scholars themselves would not have accepted either label.

Woodrow Wilson's [1] Fourteen Points (1918) provided the most influential programmatic statement of the idealist agenda for the post-war international order: national self-determination, open diplomacy, freedom of the seas, arms reduction, and above all the establishment of a League of Nations that would provide the institutional framework for collective security, arbitration of international disputes, and the progressive development of international law. Wilson's programme reflected the confluence of several intellectual traditions: Kantian liberal internationalism, with its argument that the federation of republican states would produce a condition of perpetual peace; utilitarian and classical liberal economics, with their insistence on the mutual benefits of free trade and the irrationality of war in a commercially interdependent world; and the progressive faith in the capacity of rational, scientifically informed reform to reshape social institutions in the direction of human welfare.

Norman Angell's [2] The Great Illusion (1910) — the most influential pre-war statement of the case for the economic irrationality of war — argued that the international financial and commercial interdependence of modern industrial economies had made war economically self-defeating: the victor in any modern industrial war would suffer economic losses comparable to those of the vanquished, because the disruption of international trade and finance would damage all parties to the conflict. The First World War appeared to refute Angell's argument (though Angell himself insisted that it confirmed it, since both victors and vanquished suffered enormous economic losses), and the subsequent development of classical IR theory was shaped by the need to account for the persistence of war in an economically interdependent world.

Alfred Zimmern [3], Leonard Woolf [4], and their contemporaries at the newly founded Department of International Politics at Aberystwyth developed the intellectual foundations of idealist IR in the inter-war period, producing scholarship that combined normative commitment to international

peace with empirical analysis of international institutions, international law, and the conditions of international cooperation. The League of Nations, the Permanent Court of International Justice, and the International Labour Organisation were both the practical expression of the idealist programme and the empirical objects of idealist scholarship, and the failure of these institutions to prevent the aggression of the 1930s provided the most powerful challenge to the idealist framework.

2.2 Classical Realism: Morgenthau, Power, and the National Interest

Classical realism emerged as a systematic challenge to inter-war idealism through the work of Hans J. Morgenthau, Reinhold Niebuhr, George Kennan, and their contemporaries in the 1940s and 1950s, providing both a theoretical critique of idealism's assumptions and a practical guide to statecraft in a world characterised by power competition and the absence of a reliable international authority. Morgenthau's [5] Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (1948) is the foundational text of classical realism and one of the most influential works in the history of IR theory, establishing a comprehensive theoretical framework for the study of international politics grounded in six principles that together define the realist worldview.

The first and most fundamental principle is that politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature. For Morgenthau, the constant in human nature is the desire for power — the drive to control others, to dominate, to prevail — and this drive is the primary source of political conflict at all levels, from interpersonal to international. The second principle is that the main signpost that helps political realism to find its way through the landscape of international politics is the concept of national interest defined in terms of power. States, as the primary actors in international politics, pursue their national interests defined in terms of power, and the statesman who understands this principle and acts on it achieves more for his country than the one who allows moral or ideological considerations to obscure the imperatives of power politics. The third principle is that power, though a universal concept, varies in content and form depending on the political and cultural context in which it is embedded.

Morgenthau's classical realism was deeply influenced by the European tradition of reason of state (Staatsraeson) and by the philosophical anthropology of Augustine and Niebuhr, who grounded the necessity of power politics in the sinful, prideful, and self-aggrandising nature of human beings. Reinhold Niebuhr's [6] Moral Man and Immoral Society (1932) argued that the moral possibilities of individuals, though limited, are considerably greater than those of social groups and nations, which are governed by a will to power that operates below the threshold of rational reflection and moral constraint. This theological dimension of classical realism — its grounding of the necessity of power politics in the fallen character of human nature — distinguished it from the structural approaches to

realism that would later seek to derive the same conclusions from the structure of the international system without appeal to human nature.

2.3 E. H. Carr and the Twenty Years' Crisis

E. H. Carr's [7] The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations, first published in 1939 on the eve of the Second World War, is arguably the most intellectually sophisticated and most genuinely dialectical of the founding texts of IR realism. Carr's work differs from Morgenthau's in several important respects: it is more historically specific and less abstractly theoretical; it is more explicitly engaged with the critique of idealism as an ideological formation rather than merely as a set of erroneous propositions; and it is more attentive to the relationship between power and knowledge — to the ways in which the ideas of international politics are shaped by the power relations of the states and classes that produce and promote them.

Carr's central argument in The Twenty Years' Crisis is that inter-war idealism was not merely theoretically naive but ideologically motivated: it served the interests of the status quo powers (Britain, France, and the United States) who had benefited from the post-First World War settlement and who sought to universalise their particular interests as universal principles of international order. The "harmony of interests" that liberal internationalism proclaimed — the idea that all nations had an equal interest in peace, free trade, and international law — was, Carr argued, a myth: the interests of the satisfied powers were not the same as the interests of the revisionist powers (Germany, Italy, Japan, the Soviet Union) who sought to revise the post-war order in their favour, and the attempt to enforce the existing order in the name of universal principles was itself a form of power politics.

At the same time, Carr's critique of idealism was not a simple endorsement of realism. His dialectical method — which he derived explicitly from Hegel and Marx — sought to preserve the insights of both utopianism and realism in a synthesis that acknowledged the necessity of power while maintaining the normative aspiration to a better international order. The harmony of interests was a myth, but the complete absence of common interests was equally a fiction: the shared interest in avoiding thermonuclear war, in maintaining the conditions for international trade, in preventing the spread of infectious diseases — these common interests provided the foundation for the international institutions and regimes that idealism had sought to build, and that realism too readily dismissed.

Theoretical Tradition	Core Assumptions	Key Thinkers and Texts	Primary Critique of Rivals
Classical Realism	Human nature as power-seeking; states as primary actors; national interest defined by	Morgenthau [5] Politics Among Nations; Niebuhr [6] Moral Man and Immoral Society; Carr [7] The Twenty	Idealism ignores power realities; moralistic foreign policy produces

	power; moral constraints limited in international arena; prudence as the cardinal virtue of statecraft	Years' Crisis; Kennan; Kissinger	worse outcomes than realist statecraft; international institutions cannot overcome the fundamental drives of power politics
Inter-War Idealism / Liberal Internationalism	Human nature capable of improvement; war preventable through institutional reform; international law and organisation can constrain state aggression; democracy and free trade promote peace	Wilson [1] Fourteen Points; Angell [2] The Great Illusion; Zimmern [3]; Woolf [4]; Cecil; Murray	Realism is a self-fulfilling prophecy; pessimistic assumptions about human nature ignore possibility of reform; security dilemma can be overcome through cooperation and institution-buildin g
Neorealism (Structural Realism)	Anarchy as defining feature of the international system; states as functionally undifferentiated units; relative power distribution determines state behaviour; security dilemma as structural outcome; balance of power as systemic tendency	Waltz [8] Theory of International Politics; Mearsheimer [9] The Tragedy of Great Power Politics; Grieco	Classical realism wrong to ground IR theory in human nature; structural constraints explain state behaviour without appeal to psychology; unit-level factors are secondary to systemic factors
Neoliberal Institutionalism	Anarchy is compatible with cooperation; absolute gains matter more than relative gains for many states; institutions reduce transaction costs and enable cooperation; interdependence and regimes create incentives for compliance	Keohane [10] After Hegemony; Axelrod [11] Evolution of Cooperation; Keohane and Nye [12] Power and Interdependence	Neorealism correct about anarchy but wrong to underestimate cooperation; states care about absolute not just relative gains; institutions can solve collective action problems even under anarchy

Table 1: Classical IR Theoretical Traditions — Assumptions, Thinkers, and Debates

3. Liberal Internationalism and Institutionalism

3.1 The Liberal Tradition: Kant to Functionalism

The liberal tradition in International Relations draws on a long intellectual genealogy that runs from Kant's Perpetual Peace through the nineteenth-century tradition of liberal internationalism to the inter-war idealism discussed above and the post-Second World War liberal institutionalism that shaped the construction of the Bretton Woods order, the United Nations system, and the project of European integration. Kant's [13] Zum ewigen Frieden (Perpetual Peace, 1795) is the foundational text of the liberal peace programme, arguing that a stable, durable peace requires three conditions: a republican constitution in each state (ensuring that those who bear the costs of war — citizens and soldiers — have a decisive voice in the decision to go to war); a federation of free states (providing the institutional framework for the peaceful resolution of interstate disputes); and universal hospitality (the right of every human being to be received peacefully in any state as a potential citizen of a universal commonwealth).

Kant's programme was a normative vision rather than an empirical theory, but it has served as the inspiration for the most influential empirical research programme in contemporary IR — the "democratic peace" research programme that seeks to demonstrate statistically that liberal democracies do not fight wars against each other. The democratic peace proposition, associated with Michael Doyle's [14] recovery of Kant for contemporary IR theory and subsequently tested in large-N quantitative studies by Russett and Oneal [15] and many others, represents the most empirically robust finding in IR theory: it is one of the closest things to an empirical law that the discipline has produced, though its theoretical explanation remains contested.

Between Kant and the democratic peace literature lies a rich tradition of liberal thought about international politics that includes the Manchester School's [16] advocacy of free trade as a source of international peace, the functionalist theory of international integration developed by David Mitrany [17], and the neo-functionalist theory of European integration developed by Ernst Haas [18]. Mitrany's functionalism — the theory that international cooperation begins with technical, non-political functional tasks (postal services, meteorology, health, food safety) and progressively expands to encompass more politically sensitive domains as the habit of cooperation and the recognition of mutual interdependence grow — provided the intellectual inspiration for the institutional architecture of the post-Second World War international order and for the early stages of European integration. Haas's neo-functionalism refined Mitrany's approach by identifying the process of "spillover" — the dynamic by which integration in one sector creates pressures for integration in adjacent sectors, driven by the interests of supranational bureaucrats and transnational interest groups — as the motor of progressive regional integration.

3.2 Interdependence Theory and Neoliberal Institutionalism

The most influential liberal contribution to IR theory in the 1970s and 1980s was the theory of complex interdependence developed by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye [12] in Power and Interdependence (1977). Keohane and Nye challenged the realist model of the international system — which assumed that states were the primary actors, that military force was the primary instrument of statecraft, and that security was the primary issue area — by arguing that the increasing economic, social, and informational interdependence of modern states had created a world in which non-state actors (multinational corporations, international organisations, transnational social movements) were increasingly important, in which the use of military force had become increasingly costly and in many contexts counterproductive, and in which economic and social issues had become as important as security issues in the foreign policy agendas of states.

Keohane's [10] After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy (1984) built on the interdependence framework to develop neoliberal institutionalism — the theory that international institutions (regimes, formal organisations, and informal arrangements that set rules for the conduct of international relations in specific issue areas) play a crucial role in facilitating international cooperation by reducing transaction costs, providing information, and setting expectations about state behaviour. Keohane's argument was a direct response to the realist challenge: he accepted the neorealist premises that states were rational, self-interested actors operating under anarchy, but argued that even self-interested states under anarchy would find it rational to create and maintain international institutions that enabled them to achieve joint gains that they could not achieve through unilateral action or bilateral bargaining.

The regime theory that Keohane's work inspired — the systematic study of the creation, maintenance, evolution, and effectiveness of international regimes in areas ranging from trade and monetary policy to the environment, human rights, and nuclear non-proliferation — became one of the most productive research programmes in IR from the 1980s onwards, generating a vast empirical literature on the conditions under which international cooperation is possible and the factors that determine the effectiveness of international institutions. Krasner's [19] edited volume on international regimes and the subsequent literature on regime effectiveness, institutional design, and compliance provided the empirical and theoretical foundations for the study of global governance that would become increasingly important as the post-Cold War era saw the proliferation of international institutions across virtually every domain of world politics.

3.3 Democratic Peace Theory and Liberal Order-Building

The democratic peace proposition — the empirical finding that liberal democracies virtually never go to war against each other, even while they fight wars against non-democratic states — is simultaneously

the most empirically robust finding in IR theory and one of the most contested in its theoretical interpretation. The monad version of the democratic peace proposition — the claim that democracies are inherently more peaceful than non-democracies in their foreign relations — is not consistently supported by the empirical evidence (democracies are as likely as non-democracies to initiate wars against non-democratic states). The dyadic version — the claim that pairs of democracies are extremely unlikely to go to war against each other — is supported by a large and consistent body of statistical evidence across the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and represents the strongest empirical generalisation in IR theory.

The theoretical explanations for the democratic peace are diverse and continue to be debated. Normative explanations argue that democracies extend to their relations with other democracies the norms of peaceful conflict resolution that characterise their domestic political culture — norms of compromise, negotiation, rule of law, and the legitimate management of conflict without resort to violence. Structural or institutional explanations argue that the institutional constraints of democratic politics — the need for public support, legislative approval, and media scrutiny — make democratic leaders more reluctant to initiate wars and more willing to signal their peaceful intentions credibly. Constructivist explanations argue that democracies share a liberal identity that constitutes them as members of a security community — a group of states among which war has become inconceivable — rather than merely making war between them less likely on calculation of interest.

The democratic peace proposition has had profound implications not only for IR theory but for the foreign policy practice of the liberal powers, particularly the United States. The "democracy promotion" agenda — the policy of promoting democratisation in non-democratic states as a strategy for building a more peaceful and more stable international order — derives its theoretical justification from the democratic peace proposition. The policy of NATO enlargement, the support for the "colour revolutions" in post-Soviet states, and the "freedom agenda" of the George W. Bush administration all reflected, at least in part, the democratic peace logic — the belief that expanding the zone of democracy would expand the zone of peace. The subsequent reversal of democratic trends in many states and the growing confrontation between liberal democracies and authoritarian great powers have raised fundamental questions about the scope and limits of democratic peace theory and the liberal order-building project. Ikenberry's [20] Liberal Leviathan provides the most comprehensive account of the liberal international order and its current challenges.

4. The Neo-Neo Debate: Waltz, Keohane, and Structural IR Theory

4.1 Neorealism: Waltz and the Logic of Anarchy

Kenneth Waltz's [8] Theory of International Politics (1979) is the most important work in IR theory since Morgenthau's Politics Among Nations and the text that defined the theoretical agenda of the discipline for the subsequent two decades. Waltz's neorealism — or structural realism, as he preferred to call it — sought to address the theoretical weakness that he identified in classical realism: its reliance on human nature as the explanatory variable for the behaviour of states. For Waltz, explaining the outcomes of international politics by reference to the characteristics of the units (states, statesmen, human nature) produced a fundamentally reductionist theory that could not account for the systemic patterns of international politics — the recurring tendencies toward balance of power, security competition, and the limited effectiveness of international institutions — that characterised international relations regardless of the specific characteristics of the states involved.

Waltz's solution was to develop a "systems theory" of international politics that derived the behaviour of states from the structure of the international system rather than from the characteristics of the units. The structure of the international system, on Waltz's account, is defined by two features: the organising principle (anarchy — the absence of a supreme authority standing above states and capable of enforcing rules, in contrast to the hierarchy that characterises domestic political systems) and the distribution of capabilities across the units (the number of great powers and their relative power, which determines whether the system is unipolar, bipolar, or multipolar). The functional undifferentiation of states — the fact that states in an anarchic system all perform the same basic functions of providing security and welfare for their populations — means that structure can be derived from the organising principle and capability distribution alone, without reference to the specific characteristics of individual states.

The most important structural consequence of anarchy, in Waltz's analysis, is the security dilemma: the condition in which the defensive measures taken by one state to enhance its own security are perceived as threatening by other states, who respond by enhancing their own security measures, producing a self-reinforcing spiral of arms competition and mutual insecurity in which all states end up less secure than they were before the process began. The security dilemma is not the product of malicious intent or aggressive preferences but of the structural condition of anarchy, which forces states to rely on self-help in a world where there is no external authority to protect them. This structural derivation of security competition — independent of the preferences and characteristics of the individual states involved — is Waltz's most important theoretical contribution and the feature of neorealism that most clearly distinguishes it from classical realism.

4.2 Neoliberal Institutionalism: Cooperation under Anarchy

The neoliberal institutionalist response to neorealism — developed primarily by Keohane [10] and his collaborators — accepted the neorealist premise that international politics is characterised by anarchy and that states are rational, self-interested actors, but challenged the neorealist conclusion that anarchy necessarily produces pervasive conflict and severely limited cooperation. The key neoliberal argument was that the neorealist model of strategic interaction — the zero-sum prisoner's dilemma — was too pessimistic about the conditions under which cooperation was possible, and that many real international interactions were better modelled as coordination games, assurance games, or iterated prisoner's dilemmas in which the prospects for cooperation were considerably better than in the single-shot prisoner's dilemma that neorealism implicitly assumed.

Axelrod's [11] The Evolution of Cooperation (1984) — one of the most influential works in IR theory of the 1980s — demonstrated, through computer tournaments and theoretical analysis, that a strategy of reciprocal cooperation ("tit for tat") could emerge and be sustained in iterated interactions between self-interested actors without any central authority to enforce it. Axelrod's findings suggested that the conditions for international cooperation — the "shadow of the future" (the expectation of continued interaction), iterated interaction, and the capacity for reciprocal punishment of defection — were present in many real international relationships, and that the difficulty of achieving cooperation in international politics was therefore considerably less severe than neorealists claimed.

The neoliberal argument about absolute versus relative gains was the most important direct challenge to the neorealist account of the limits of cooperation. Neorealists argued that states in a competitive international system care primarily about relative gains — about whether they are gaining more or less than their rivals — rather than absolute gains — the absolute improvement in their own welfare. If states care primarily about relative gains, then a potential outcome that benefits all parties but benefits some more than others may be rejected by the less-benefited parties because it improves the relative position of potential rivals. Neoliberals challenged this claim, arguing that the extent to which states care about relative versus absolute gains depends on the specific issue area and the nature of the states' relationship: states care most about relative gains in security-relevant issue areas where a shift in the relative balance of capabilities could directly affect their security, but care more about absolute gains in economic issue areas where the primary concern is with maximising economic welfare rather than maintaining military superiority.

4.3 The Neo-Neo Synthesis and Its Limits

The debate between neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism — the "neo-neo debate" — was the defining theoretical controversy in mainstream IR theory from the mid-1980s to the early 1990s. Despite the acrimony with which it was sometimes conducted, the neo-neo debate also revealed the

extent to which the two approaches shared a common theoretical framework: both were rationalist in their assumptions about state behaviour (states are rational actors who pursue well-defined interests); both were structural in their analytical orientation (the structure of the international system — whether defined in terms of anarchy and capability distribution or in terms of the institutional environment — is the primary determinant of state behaviour); and both were positivist in their epistemological commitments (theoretical claims should be tested against empirical evidence using scientific methods).

This shared framework — often described as the "neo-neo synthesis" — defined what Ruggie [21] called the "neoutilitarian" core of mainstream IR theory: the assumption that states are utility-maximising actors, that their utility functions are defined by material interests, and that the structure of the international system (whether anarchic or institutionally ordered) determines the strategies through which they pursue those interests. The neo-neo synthesis provided the intellectual framework within which most mainstream IR theory was conducted during the 1980s and early 1990s, and the research programmes it generated — the quantitative study of interstate conflict, the study of international regime creation and effectiveness, the formal modelling of strategic interaction — produced important empirical findings and theoretical insights.

The limits of the neo-neo synthesis became apparent, however, from several directions. First, the neo-neo framework was unable to account for the transformative change represented by the end of the Cold War: neither neorealism nor neoliberal institutionalism predicted the peaceful dissolution of the Soviet Union, the voluntary German reunification within NATO, or the rapid transformation of the European security order. The failure to predict or explain these events was not merely an empirical embarrassment but a theoretical one: it suggested that the neo-neo framework's focus on material structures and rational interests had missed something fundamental about the role of ideas, norms, and identities in shaping the dynamics of international politics. Second, the growing power of critical, constructivist, feminist, and post-colonial challenges drew attention to the theoretical and political exclusions of the neo-neo synthesis — its neglect of non-material factors, its masculinist assumptions, its Eurocentric perspective, and its reproduction of the status quo. These challenges would transform the discipline in ways that the neo-neo synthesis had not anticipated and could not accommodate.

5. Constructivism and the Social Turn in IR

5.1 The Constructivist Challenge: Wendt, Onuf, and Kratochwil

Constructivism emerged as a distinct theoretical approach in IR theory in the late 1980s and early 1990s, offering a challenge to the neo-neo synthesis from within the broadly positivist mainstream of the discipline while sharing certain analytical commitments with the more radical critical approaches that attacked the neo-neo framework from without. The constructivist challenge was grounded in a fundamental reorientation of the theoretical framework of IR: against the neo-neo assumption that the structure of the international system is constituted by the material distribution of capabilities, constructivism argued that the structure of international politics is fundamentally social — constituted by the shared ideas, norms, rules, and identities that shape what states understand themselves to be, what interests they pursue, and how they interact with each other.

Nicholas Onuf's [22] World of Our Making (1989) first introduced the term "constructivism" to IR theory, developing a systematic framework for the analysis of international politics as a social construction based on the rules, norms, and practices through which agents constitute both themselves and the structures within which they act. Friedrich Kratochwil's [23] Rules, Norms, and Decisions (1989), published in the same year, developed a parallel argument about the centrality of rules and norms in international politics, challenging the rationalist assumption that rules are merely constraints on pre-formed interests and arguing instead that rules constitute the identities and interests of actors rather than merely regulating their behaviour.

Alexander Wendt's [24] "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics" (1992) is the most widely read and most cited article in the constructivist literature, providing a clear and accessible statement of the constructivist challenge to neorealism in terms that engaged directly with the neo-neo debate. Wendt's central argument was that the neorealist claim — that anarchy necessarily produces self-help and power politics — was wrong: anarchy is a structural feature of the international system, but it does not by itself determine whether states will relate to each other in terms of enmity, rivalry, or friendship. The logic of self-help emerges not from anarchy as such but from the particular social practices of competitive self-help that states have historically constructed and that have become institutionalised as the dominant pattern of international interaction. Different patterns of interaction — characterised by different social identities, different norms, and different expectations of other states' behaviour — are possible under anarchy, and the transformation of the international system from a Hobbesian culture of enmity to a Lockean culture of rivalry or a Kantian culture of friendship depends on the transformation of the shared ideas, norms, and identities that constitute states' understanding of themselves and each other.

5.2 Norms, Identity, and the Social Construction of International Reality

Wendt's [25] Social Theory of International Politics (1999) provided the most comprehensive and most systematic statement of constructivist IR theory, developing a "scientific constructivism" that sought to combine the constructivist insistence on the social constitution of international structures with a commitment to the positivist methodological standards of mainstream IR theory. Wendt's "state-centric" constructivism — which retained the state as the primary unit of analysis while insisting on the irreducibly social character of state identity and interest — was positioned as a "via media" between the material structuralism of neorealism and the radical idealism of post-structural and critical approaches, seeking to incorporate the insights of both without collapsing into either.

The constructivist research programme that Wendt's work inspired generated a rich and diverse body of empirical scholarship on the role of norms, ideas, and identities in international politics. Finnemore and Sikkink's [26] analysis of the "norm life cycle" — the process by which new international norms emerge, become internalised by states and non-state actors, and eventually achieve the status of taken-for-granted rules of appropriate behaviour — provided one of the most influential frameworks for the empirical study of norm diffusion and socialisation. Their account of the three stages of norm development (emergence, cascade, and internalisation) and the role of "norm entrepreneurs" — individuals and organisations who advocate for new norms and who work to persuade states and publics to adopt them — provided the theoretical foundation for a vast body of empirical work on the origins and effects of international norms in areas ranging from human rights and humanitarian law to the environment, arms control, and international criminal justice.

Katzenstein's [27] edited volume The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics provided the most comprehensive early demonstration of the empirical productivity of the constructivist research programme, bringing together case studies on the role of norms and identity in the foreign and security policies of a range of states that collectively demonstrated that material factors alone were insufficient to explain many of the most important patterns of state behaviour. The subsequent development of constructivist research on identity politics in international relations, on the socialisation of states into international norms through membership of international organisations, and on the contestation of international norms by states and non-state actors has produced one of the most productive research programmes in contemporary IR.

5.3 Constructivism in Practice: Norms Emergence and the Power of Ideas

The constructivist account of the role of norms and ideas in international politics has proved particularly productive in the analysis of the spread of international human rights norms. Risse, Ropp, and Sikkink's [28] edited volume The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change provided the most influential empirical demonstration of the constructivist norm diffusion mechanism, tracing the

process through which international human rights norms are internalised by states through a combination of external pressure, transnational advocacy network activity, and domestic normative change. Their "spiral model" of human rights change — which identifies five phases in the process through which states move from systematic human rights violations to genuine human rights compliance — provided a theoretical framework for understanding the mechanisms of human rights change that challenged both the realist dismissal of human rights norms as mere rhetoric and the liberal institutionalist assumption that institutional membership produces automatic compliance.

The constructivist approach to security studies has also generated important insights about the social construction of security threats and the role of securitisation — the speech act through which an actor designates a specific issue as an existential threat requiring emergency measures beyond the normal constraints of political process — in shaping the security agendas of states. The Copenhagen School's development of securitisation theory (discussed in more detail in Section 7.3) represented the most systematic application of constructivist and post-structural insights to the core topic of security studies, challenging the materialist and objectivist assumptions of mainstream security studies and demonstrating the analytical productivity of treating security not as an objective condition but as a social and political construction.

Constructivism has also contributed important insights to the analysis of international institutions and the processes through which international organisations shape state behaviour. Barnett and Finnemore's [29] Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics developed a constructivist theory of international organisations as autonomous actors with their own identities, interests, and pathologies, challenging both the neoliberal institutionalist account of international organisations as tools of state interests and the realist dismissal of international organisations as epiphenomenal. Their analysis of the ways in which international organisations use their authority to define problems, set agendas, and classify states and situations showed how the exercise of organisational power shapes the terms in which international political problems are understood and addressed.

6. Critical Theories: Marxism, the Frankfurt School, and World-Systems

6.1 Marxist and Neo-Marxist Approaches to World Politics

Marxist and neo-Marxist approaches to international relations offer a fundamental challenge to both the realist and liberal traditions by insisting that the primary forces shaping world politics are not the power politics of states or the institutional frameworks of international cooperation but the dynamics of global capitalism — the international relations of production, the extraction of surplus value from labour, the uneven geographic development of capitalist accumulation, and the class struggles and social contradictions that these processes generate. For classical Marxism, the state is not an autonomous actor pursuing a coherent national interest but an instrument of the capitalist class — a set of institutions through which the bourgeoisie exercises its political power and organises the conditions for the reproduction of capitalist social relations, including the international conditions (access to markets and raw materials, protection of investment, suppression of labour movements) necessary for the continued accumulation of capital.

Lenin's [30] Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism (1916) provided the most influential classical Marxist account of international politics, arguing that the export of capital — the search for higher rates of profit in less-developed regions — was the primary driver of the imperialist expansion of the major capitalist powers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and that the First World War was a product of the competition between the major capitalist powers for colonial territories, markets, and investment opportunities. Lenin's theory of imperialism was the first systematic attempt to explain the structure of international politics in terms of the dynamics of capitalist accumulation rather than the balance of power or the pursuit of national interest, and it established the agenda for subsequent Marxist and neo-Marxist analysis of the relationship between capitalism and world politics.

Neo-Marxist approaches to international relations developed Lenin's analysis in several directions during the twentieth century. Dependency theory — associated with Latin American structuralist economists and social scientists including Frank [31], Cardoso, and Faletto — argued that the underdevelopment of the periphery was not a result of the traditional societies' failure to modernise but a direct product of their integration into the world capitalist system, which structurally disadvantaged them relative to the core capitalist powers and systematically transferred resources from periphery to core through unequal exchange, technology dependence, and the terms of trade. Dependency theory provided the intellectual foundation for many of the policy prescriptions of the New International Economic Order (NIEO) movement of the 1970s, including demands for preferential trade arrangements, commodity agreements, technology transfer, and reform of the international monetary system.

6.2 Cox's Critical Theory and the World Order Approach

Robert Cox's contribution to IR theory — developed in a series of articles and books from the 1980s onwards, most influentially in "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory" [32] (1981) and Production, Power, and World Order [33] (1987) — represents the most sophisticated and most theoretically ambitious attempt to develop a comprehensive critical theory of world politics grounded in the Gramscian tradition of neo-Marxist political thought. Cox's critical theory of world order is distinguished from what he calls "problem-solving theory" — the approach, exemplified by neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism, that takes the existing structures of world politics as given and seeks to understand and manage the problems that arise within them — by its commitment to historicising those structures, uncovering the social forces and political struggles through which they were created and through which they are maintained, and identifying the possibilities for their transformation in the direction of greater human emancipation.

Cox's analytical framework identifies three interacting levels of social reality: the level of productive forces and social relations of production; the level of forms of state; and the level of world orders. Each of these levels is defined by a configuration of material capabilities, institutions, and ideas — the three elements that Cox, following Gramsci, sees as constituting the hegemony of a particular world order. The concept of hegemony — which Cox draws from Gramsci's analysis of the mechanisms through which ruling classes maintain their dominance not merely through coercion but through the "manufacture of consent," the creation of a common sense that presents their particular interests as universal — is central to Cox's account of how specific world orders are stabilised and how they can be transformed. The Pax Americana — the post-Second World War liberal international order organised around American hegemony — is understood in Cox's framework not as a neutral system of rules and institutions serving universal interests but as the expression of a particular configuration of social forces, class interests, and ideological formations that serves the interests of transnational capital and the advanced capitalist states while systematically disadvantaging labour, the Global South, and other subordinate social forces.

Cox's world order approach has been enormously influential in shaping the critical theory tradition in IR and has provided the theoretical framework for a diverse body of empirical research on the political economy of globalisation, the governance of international financial institutions, and the contestation of the liberal international order. Gill's [34] Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations and the subsequent literature on "new constitutionalism" — the process by which the rules and disciplines of global capitalism are progressively insulated from democratic contestation through the legal and institutional architecture of international economic governance — have developed Cox's framework in ways that connect international political economy to the broader critical theory tradition.

6.3 World-Systems Theory: Wallerstein and Global Capitalism

Immanuel Wallerstein's [35] world-systems theory — developed in The Modern World-System (three volumes, 1974, 1980, 1989) and numerous subsequent works — provides the most ambitious and most historically comprehensive attempt to analyse the dynamics of the capitalist world-economy as a single social system. Wallerstein's central argument is that the appropriate unit of analysis for the social sciences is not the individual nation-state (as in most IR theory) or the individual economy (as in mainstream economics) but the world-system — the integrated social system defined by a single division of labour, a single market, and an overarching set of political and cultural relations that have encompassed virtually the entire globe since the sixteenth century.

The capitalist world-economy, in Wallerstein's analysis, is characterised by a persistent structural hierarchy: the core (the advanced industrial states that dominate the world division of labour, concentrate high-value, capital-intensive production, and appropriate the bulk of the surplus generated within the world-system); the semi-periphery (states in intermediate positions that perform a mixture of core-like and periphery-like functions and that serve as a buffer between core and periphery); and the periphery (states and regions that specialise in low-value, labour-intensive production and raw material extraction and that are structurally disadvantaged in the exchange of their products for those of the core). This spatial division of labour is not fixed — states can move up or down in the world-system hierarchy over time — but the hierarchy itself is a persistent structural feature of the capitalist world-economy that cannot be dissolved by individual state policies or by international reform measures short of the transformation of the world-system itself.

World-systems theory has provided the theoretical framework for important empirical research on the long-run dynamics of the world economy, the historical patterns of core-periphery relations, and the political economy of development and underdevelopment. However, it has also attracted significant criticism: from a methodological standpoint, for its tendency to reify the world-system as a super-entity with its own developmental logic rather than analysing it as the product of specific social forces and political struggles; from a political standpoint, for its structural determinism, which seems to leave little room for political agency and collective action in challenging the imperatives of the world-system; and from a feminist and post-colonial standpoint, for its neglect of gender, race, and culture as autonomous dimensions of social inequality that cannot be reduced to the dynamics of capitalist accumulation.

7. Post-Structuralism, Discourse, and the Linguistic Turn

7.1 Derrida, Foucault, and the Deconstruction of IR

Post-structural approaches to International Relations — drawing on the philosophical work of Derrida, Foucault, Lyotard, Lacan, and Baudrillard — represent the most radical challenge to the theoretical and epistemological foundations of mainstream IR theory, questioning not merely the substantive claims of realism, liberalism, and constructivism but the very possibility of objective, scientific knowledge about international politics. Post-structuralism's challenge operates at three levels: at the ontological level, it questions the stability and coherence of the entities (states, nations, interests, identities) that IR theory takes as its basic units of analysis; at the epistemological level, it challenges the positivist assumption that theoretical knowledge can represent international reality independently of the power relations and discursive formations that shape what can be said, known, and thought about that reality; and at the political level, it exposes the ways in which IR theory reproduces the exclusions, silences, and hierarchies of the international order that it purports to describe objectively.

Foucault's [36] concept of discourse — understood not merely as language but as the entire set of practices, institutions, and knowledges through which subjects, objects, and truth claims are constituted in specific historical and social contexts — has been the most influential post-structural concept for IR theory. The Foucauldian analysis of discourse allows IR scholars to examine how particular representations of international reality — the "anarchic international system," the "rogue state," the "terrorist threat," the "humanitarian crisis," the "failed state" — are not neutral descriptions of independently existing phenomena but are constituted through specific discursive practices that simultaneously shape what is known about international politics and what policies, interventions, and forms of power are thereby legitimated.

Der Derian and Shapiro's [37] edited volume International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics was the foundational text of post-structural IR, bringing together a set of essays that applied post-structural theoretical frameworks to the analysis of diplomatic theory and practice, strategic culture, international law, and the aesthetics of international politics. R. B. J. Walker's [38] Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory developed the most sustained philosophical critique of the foundations of IR theory, arguing that the discipline was structured around the spatial distinction between the "inside" (the domestic sphere of political community, democracy, and social solidarity) and the "outside" (the international sphere of anarchy, power politics, and the absence of community) — a distinction that reproduced specific forms of political exclusion and foreclosed the possibility of genuinely cosmopolitan forms of political community.

7.2 Security Studies and the Widening of the Security Agenda

The field of security studies underwent a profound transformation from the 1980s onwards as a result of the combined impact of constructivist, critical, and post-structural challenges to the dominant "strategic studies" framework that had defined the field during the Cold War. Traditional security studies — dominated by the analysis of military threats, deterrence, alliance politics, and arms control — was challenged by a diverse set of voices arguing for the "widening" and "deepening" of the security concept to encompass non-military threats (environmental degradation, economic insecurity, health crises, food insecurity), non-state actors (terrorist groups, criminal organisations, transnational social movements), non-state referent objects (individuals, communities, societies), and non-Western security concerns that had been systematically marginalised by a security discourse dominated by the strategic interests of the major Western powers.

Barry Buzan's [39] People, States and Fear provided the most systematic early attempt to develop a comprehensive framework for the analysis of security that extended beyond the traditional military focus to encompass political, economic, societal, and environmental sectors. Buzan's sector-based framework — which analyses threats and vulnerabilities in each of the five sectors (military, political, economic, societal, environmental) and the interactions between them — provided the conceptual foundation for the broadened security agenda that has come to characterise security studies in the post-Cold War era. The subsequent development of human security theory — associated particularly with the United Nations Development Programme's [40] Human Development Report 1994, which introduced the concept of human security and argued for a fundamental reorientation of security policy from state security to individual security — represented the most radical expression of the widened security agenda and had significant influence on the foreign policies of several middle powers and on the development of the Responsibility to Protect doctrine.

7.3 The Copenhagen School and Securitisation Theory

The Copenhagen School — associated primarily with Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, and Jaap de Wilde, and most fully developed in Buzan, Waever, and de Wilde's [41] Security: A New Framework for Analysis (1998) — represents one of the most influential and most theoretically sophisticated developments in post-Cold War security studies, combining elements of constructivism, speech act theory, and post-structural discourse analysis in a framework for the analysis of the securitisation and desecuritisation of political issues. The central concept of securitisation — the process through which an actor (a "securitising actor") designates a specific issue as an existential threat to a referent object and thereby justifies the adoption of emergency measures that transcend the normal constraints of political process — draws on Austin's speech act theory to analyse security as a performative utterance rather than an objective condition.

The Copenhagen School's securitisation framework has several important analytical implications that distinguish it from both traditional security studies and from the broader constructivist approach to security. First, it locates the constitution of security threats in the discursive practices of political actors rather than in objective material conditions: a threat becomes a security threat not because of its objective properties but because a securitising actor successfully designates it as such and an audience accepts that designation. Second, it implies that the appropriate response to excessive securitisation is desecuritisation — the return of issues from the securitised realm of emergency politics to the normal realm of deliberative political debate — rather than the further securitisation of additional issues. Third, it draws attention to the political consequences of securitisation: by designating an issue as a security threat, actors create the conditions for the adoption of emergency measures (surveillance, preemptive action, suspension of civil liberties, military intervention) that would not be acceptable in normal political discourse.

Critical / Post-Positivist Approach	Core Analytical Claims	Key Contributions to IR	Critique of Mainstream IR
Constructivism (Mainstream)	International structure is social not merely material; norms, ideas, and identities shape state behaviour; states' interests are not given but socially constituted; anarchy is what states make of it	Norm diffusion research programme; socialisation theory; analysis of identity and interest formation; security community concept; bridge between positivist and critical approaches	Neorealism and neoliberalism treat state interests as given; ignore role of ideas and norms; cannot explain transformative change such as end of Cold War
Critical Theory (Cox/Gramsci)	All theory is for someone and for some purpose; existing world order serves interests of dominant social forces; hegemony operates through ideas and institutions not just material power; possibilities of transformation must be identified	World order analysis; concept of hegemony in IR; analysis of transnational class forces; political economy of global governance; historicisation of IR structures	Problem-solving theory legitimises existing order; neorealism and neoliberalism are ideological; ignore class, production relations, and potential for emancipatory change
Post-Structuralism	Knowledge and discourse constitute reality rather than reflecting it; identities and interests are discursively produced; IR theory reproduces the exclusions of the international order;	Discourse analysis of security; deconstruction of sovereignty; analysis of foreign policy as identity practice; critique of humanitarian intervention discourse; Foucauldian governmentality analysis	All mainstream IR theory is complicit with the power structures it describes; positivism's claim to objective knowledge

	inside/outside distinction structures IR		conceals the political commitments embedded in all IR knowledge
Feminist IR	Gender is a fundamental axis of power in international relations; IR's core concepts (security, sovereignty, power) are gendered; women's experiences of international politics are systematically ignored; gender hierarchy shapes war, economy, and diplomacy	Feminist security studies; gender analysis of war and militarism; political economy of gender and globalisation; feminist methodology for IR research; women, peace and security agenda	Mainstream IR is masculinist; its central categories (the sovereign state, the rational actor, the security dilemma) are gendered constructs that exclude women's experiences and reproduce gender hierarchy

Table 2: Post-Positivist and Critical Approaches to IR — Claims, Contributions, and Critiques

8. Feminist International Relations

8.1 The Feminist Intervention: Tickner, Enloe, and Gender in IR

Feminist International Relations emerged as a distinct theoretical tradition in the late 1980s and early 1990s, challenging the mainstream discipline with a deceptively simple question: "Where are the women?" Cynthia Enloe's [42] Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics (1989) was the founding text of feminist IR, demonstrating through a series of richly textured case studies that women were not absent from international politics — as the silence of mainstream IR theory implied — but were present everywhere, performing the essential but systematically invisible labour (as diplomats' wives, base town prostitutes, plantation workers, hotel chambermaids, export processing zone workers) that made the international political and economic order possible. Enloe's work demonstrated that taking women's experiences seriously required not merely adding gender as another variable to existing IR frameworks but fundamentally transforming the discipline's understanding of what international politics was, who the relevant actors were, and what counted as politically significant.

J. Ann Tickner's [43] Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security (1992) provided the most systematic theoretical statement of the feminist challenge to mainstream IR, subjecting Morgenthau's six principles of political realism to a feminist critique that exposed the gendered assumptions embedded in each of them. Tickner's central argument was that realism's core concepts — power, the national interest, rational statecraft — were not gender-neutral but were defined in terms of stereotypically masculine values (autonomy, rationality, competitiveness, strength) that excluded stereotypically feminine values (interdependence, empathy, cooperation, care) and thereby produced a partial and distorted account of international politics. A feminist reformulation of realism's core concepts would not merely add a gender dimension to existing theory but would transform the theoretical framework by incorporating the relational, care-oriented, and solidaristic values that feminist theory identifies with the "feminine" but that are not the exclusive property of women.

The feminist debate with mainstream IR has been structured around two distinct but related challenges. The empirical challenge asks mainstream IR to take account of the gendered dimensions of the phenomena it studies: the ways in which gender shapes who fights in wars and who is protected (and who is sexually violated), who governs states and who is governed, who benefits from globalisation and who bears its costs, and who is represented in international institutions and who is excluded. The epistemological challenge asks mainstream IR to confront the gendered character of its knowledge-production practices: the way in which the assumption of a detached, objective, universal

standpoint for IR knowledge conceals a specifically masculine standpoint that systematically marginalises women's experiences and perspectives.

8.2 Feminist Security Studies and the Politics of Protection

The feminist contribution to security studies has been one of the most substantively significant and most politically consequential dimensions of feminist IR, transforming the discipline's understanding of the gendered dimensions of war, violence, and security. Feminist security scholars have made three major analytical contributions to the field. First, they have demonstrated that war and armed conflict involve systematic forms of gender-based violence — including mass rape, sexual slavery, forced pregnancy, and other forms of sexual violence — that mainstream security studies had systematically neglected as peripheral to the "real" political and strategic dimensions of armed conflict. The recognition of rape as a weapon of war and a crime against humanity, and its subsequent incorporation into international humanitarian law and international criminal justice, represents one of the most significant practical achievements of feminist IR scholarship.

Second, feminist security scholars have challenged the traditional distinction between combatants and non-combatants that structures mainstream security studies, arguing that women's experiences of war — as refugees, as victims of sexual violence, as informal providers of material and emotional support for armed combatants, as peace activists and reconciliation workers — are not peripheral to the security dynamics of armed conflict but central to them. Enloe's [44] The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War and subsequent feminist security studies scholarship demonstrated that the sexual politics of military bases, the gender dynamics of post-conflict reconstruction, and the political economy of women's labour in post-war societies were not soft issues but hard strategic questions that any adequate account of security had to address.

Third, feminist security scholars have developed a critical analysis of the "protection racket" that underlies mainstream security discourse — the dynamic by which states claim the authority to protect their citizens (and particularly their women) from external threats in ways that simultaneously reproduce the internal structures of gender domination. Young's [45] "The Logic of Masculinist Protection" argued that the political logic of protection — in which protectors claim authority and obedience from those they protect — reproduces the gendered power hierarchy between strong, active, protective masculinity and vulnerable, passive, dependent femininity at the international as well as the domestic level. The war on terrorism's mobilisation of the rhetoric of protecting Afghan women to justify the invasion of Afghanistan was, on this feminist analysis, a classic instance of the use of the politics of protection to legitimate the exercise of imperial power.

8.3 Feminist Contributions to IR Theory and Practice

The feminist contribution to IR theory and practice extends well beyond security studies to encompass international political economy, diplomacy, foreign policy analysis, international law, and global governance. The feminist political economy of globalisation has demonstrated the systematic gender dimensions of the international economic order: the concentration of women in the most exploitative sectors of global production chains (export processing zones, domestic service, the informal economy); the feminisation of poverty as neoliberal structural adjustment programmes cut public services on which women disproportionately depend; and the ways in which global financial governance systematically privileges the interests of transnational capital over the reproductive and care work that women disproportionately perform.

The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security (2000) — which recognised the disproportionate impact of armed conflict on women and called for the increased participation of women in peace negotiations, post-conflict reconstruction, and the institutions of global governance — represented the most significant practical achievement of feminist IR scholarship at the level of international policy. The subsequent development of the Women, Peace and Security agenda within the UN system, and the growing body of evidence that peace agreements are more durable and post-conflict societies more stable when women are meaningfully included in peace processes, have provided empirical support for the feminist argument that the exclusion of women from international politics is not merely unjust but strategically counterproductive.

Spike Peterson's [46] Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory and the subsequent development of feminist contributions to international law, global governance, and cosmopolitan political theory have extended the feminist project beyond the initial focus on security and military politics to encompass the full range of international political phenomena. The emergence of feminist constructivism — which combines constructivism's attention to the role of norms and identities with feminist theory's analysis of gender as a constitutive dimension of international political structures — has been one of the most productive theoretical developments in recent feminist IR, enabling the analysis of how gender norms are reproduced and contested in international institutions and how the international diffusion of gender equality norms shapes the domestic politics of recipient states.

9. Post-Colonial International Relations

9.1 The Post-Colonial Challenge to Eurocentric IR

Post-colonial International Relations represents the most fundamental and most wide-ranging challenge to the mainstream discipline, questioning not merely the substantive claims of realism, liberalism, constructivism, and critical theory but the Eurocentric foundations of the entire disciplinary project. The post-colonial critique begins from the observation that IR as a discipline was founded by, and continues to be dominated by, scholars from Western Europe and North America who have systematically produced a body of theory that reflects and serves the interests of Western powers and that marginalises, silences, or distorts the experiences, perspectives, and knowledges of the non-Western world. The categories, frameworks, and assumptions of mainstream IR theory — the sovereign territorial state, the anarchic international system, the rational unitary actor, the balance of power — are not universal analytical categories applicable to all times and places but specific historical formations produced by the particular political and intellectual traditions of Western modernity.

The post-colonial challenge to IR theory operates at three distinct but interrelated levels. First, it challenges the empirical record of IR theory by demonstrating that the historical experiences of the non-Western world — colonialism, imperialism, racism, the slave trade, forced labour, cultural suppression — are not peripheral anomalies in the history of the international system but are central to the processes through which the modern international order was constructed and through which the current distribution of wealth, power, and political capacity between the Global North and the Global South was produced. The existing international order was not built on the principles of sovereign equality, mutual benefit, and the rule of law that liberal IR theory celebrates but on the systematic dispossession, exploitation, and subjugation of the non-Western world.

Second, the post-colonial challenge questions the conceptual framework of mainstream IR theory by showing that its core concepts are historically and culturally specific constructs that cannot be universalised without distorting the political realities of non-Western societies. The sovereign territorial state — the basic unit of analysis in both realist and liberal IR theory — is a specifically European institutional form that was imposed on much of the non-Western world through colonial conquest and that continues to sit uneasily with the political cultures, social structures, and territorial arrangements of many post-colonial states. The assumption that all states are functionally equivalent units pursuing their national interest in an anarchic system ignores the profound differences in power, capacity, and legitimacy between the major Western powers and the vast majority of states in the Global South, whose sovereignty is nominal rather than effective and whose foreign policy options are severely constrained by the structural inequalities of the international system.

9.2 Fanon, Said, and the Politics of Knowledge in IR

Frantz Fanon's [47] The Wretched of the Earth (1961) — the most powerful and most politically charged of the foundational texts of post-colonial theory — provided a systematic analysis of the psychological, cultural, and political dimensions of colonial domination and anti-colonial resistance that has remained central to post-colonial IR theory. Fanon's analysis of the "colonial situation" — the specific social formation created by the imposition of European colonialism on non-European societies — identified the systematic dehumanisation of the colonised as the defining feature of colonial power: colonialism operates not merely through physical coercion but through the cultural and psychological dispossession of the colonised, who are denied the status of full humanity and who internalise the coloniser's definition of them as inferior, backward, and incapable of self-governance.

Edward Said's [48] Orientalism (1978) — drawing on Foucault's discourse analysis to examine the ways in which the Western academic, literary, and political tradition has systematically produced and reproduced a representation of "the Orient" as exotic, backward, irrational, and threatening in contrast to the rational, progressive, and civilised "Occident" — provided the most influential post-colonial analysis of the politics of knowledge production in the context of colonial and post-colonial power relations. Said's argument that Orientalism is not merely a set of ideas about the East but a "discourse" in the Foucauldian sense — a system of knowledge-power that simultaneously constitutes its object and legitimates the political relationships of colonial domination and post-colonial hegemony — has been profoundly influential on the development of post-colonial IR theory and on the broader "post-colonial turn" in the humanities and social sciences.

The application of Said's discourse analysis to the study of international relations has generated important insights about the ways in which Western representations of non-Western peoples and societies have served to legitimate colonial and post-colonial forms of intervention and domination. The representation of "rogue states," "failed states," "the axis of evil," and "ungoverned spaces" in contemporary Western foreign policy discourse reproduces, in updated form, the colonial discourse of civilisation and barbarism that legitimated the earlier phases of Western imperial expansion. Doty's [49] Imperial Encounters: The Politics of Representation in North-South Relations provided one of the most systematic applications of post-colonial discourse analysis to contemporary international politics, demonstrating how the discursive constitution of "the Third World" in development discourse, humanitarian intervention discourse, and security discourse reproduces the colonial relations of power and knowledge in the contemporary global order.

9.3 Non-Western IR Theory and Global IR

The recognition that mainstream IR theory is not only Eurocentric in its intellectual genealogy but also inadequate as an account of the international politics of the non-Western world has stimulated an

important debate about the need for "non-Western IR theory" and for the development of a genuinely "Global IR" that incorporates the perspectives, experiences, and intellectual traditions of the entire world. Acharya and Buzan's [50] Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia provided the most comprehensive survey of the attempts to develop IR theories grounded in non-Western intellectual traditions, examining the prospects for IR theories drawing on Confucian, Buddhist, Hindu, Islamic, and African political thought, as well as the IR theoretical contributions of scholars from the major emerging powers — China, India, Brazil, and South Africa.

The Chinese school of IR — the attempt to develop IR theory drawing on Chinese intellectual traditions including Confucianism, the concept of tianxia (all-under-heaven), and the historical practices of the tributary system — has attracted particular attention in the context of China's rise to great power status and the associated debates about whether China's foreign policy behaviour can be understood in terms of existing IR theories or requires a distinctively Chinese theoretical framework. Zhao Tingyang's [51] concept of tianxia — the idea of a world order based on a shared sense of global community and mutual responsibility rather than the anarchic competition of sovereign states — represents one of the most philosophically ambitious attempts to develop a non-Western alternative to the Westphalian state system that underlies mainstream IR theory.

Acharya's [52] The End of American World Order argued that the liberal international order was being transformed not by a straightforward return to great power rivalry but by the emergence of a more pluralist world in which the ideas, institutions, and norms of global governance are increasingly contested and reconstructed by states and non-state actors from the Global South as well as the Global North. This "multiplex world" — characterised by multiple overlapping regional and global governance architectures, multiple sources of normative authority, and multiple centres of economic and political power — required, Acharya argued, a more genuinely global IR theory that could account for the perspectives and contributions of all the world's major civilisations and political traditions rather than merely universalising the experience and theory of the Western powers.

10. IR in the Twenty-First Century: New Challenges

10.1 Globalisation, Global Governance, and the Liberal Order

The post-Cold War era opened with a moment of liberal triumphalism — Fukuyama's [53] proclamation of "The End of History" and the apparent vindication of the liberal democratic model as the final form of human political organisation — that proved spectacularly premature. The two decades following the Cold War were characterised, in the mainstream IR narrative, by the consolidation and extension of the liberal international order: the enlargement of NATO and the EU into Central and Eastern Europe; the expansion of the WTO to encompass virtually the entire global economy; the proliferation of international human rights mechanisms and institutions; and the development of the concept of humanitarian intervention and the Responsibility to Protect as frameworks for addressing mass atrocities within sovereign states. Ikenberry's [20] account of the liberal international order as a durable and self-reinforcing institutional framework reflected the dominant mood of liberal optimism in the immediate post-Cold War period.

The multiple crises of the second decade of the twenty-first century — the 2008 global financial crisis, the Arab Spring and its aftermath, the rise of China and Russia as revisionist great powers, the Brexit vote, the election of Donald Trump, the COVID-19 pandemic, and the Russian invasion of Ukraine — have fundamentally transformed the debate about the future of the liberal international order. Scholars now debate whether the liberal order is merely under stress (in need of reform and renewal) or in terminal decline (being replaced by a more authoritarian, more multipolar, and less rules-based international order). Mearsheimer's [9] realist argument that the liberal order was always more fragile and more dependent on American hegemony than its liberal champions acknowledged has gained renewed currency, while liberal scholars like Ikenberry [20] argue that the order's institutional depth and the genuine interests that states have in its continuation make it more resilient than the current turbulence suggests.

The concept of global governance — the complex of multilateral institutions, international regimes, transnational networks, and private regulatory arrangements through which global collective action problems are addressed in the absence of world government — has become one of the central organising concepts of post-Cold War IR, capturing the proliferation of governance arrangements beyond the state that the liberal institutionalist tradition had anticipated and that the realist tradition had consistently underestimated. Held and McGrew's [54] analysis of globalisation and the prospects for cosmopolitan democracy, and the subsequent literature on global governance, multilateralism, and legitimacy, have engaged with the fundamental questions about political authority, democratic accountability, and the relationship between national and global governance that the governance turn in world politics has raised.

10.2 The Rise of China, Multipolarity, and Power Transition

The rise of China as a potential peer competitor to the United States is the most significant structural change in world politics since the end of the Cold War and has generated one of the most important theoretical debates in contemporary IR: the debate about power transition and whether the peaceful accommodation of a rising China within the liberal international order is possible or whether, as power transition theory predicts, the displacement of a hegemonic power by a rising challenger is inherently prone to conflict. The power transition theory associated with Organski [55] and subsequently developed by Organski and Kugler argues that the most dangerous periods in the history of the international system are those in which a rising power approaches parity with the dominant power, because the dissatisfied challenger is likely to use force while it still can rather than waiting until the dominant power has a chance to consolidate its position against the challenge.

The debate about China's rise has engaged virtually all of the major IR theoretical traditions. Mearsheimer's [9] offensive realism predicts that China's rise will inevitably produce intense security competition with the United States, as China seeks regional hegemony in Asia and the United States seeks to prevent the rise of a peer competitor that could challenge American global dominance. Liberal institutionalists argue that China's deep integration into the global economy and its membership of major international institutions create powerful incentives for continued engagement with the liberal order rather than confrontation with it — though the growing evidence of China's willingness to use economic coercion and to challenge the norms of the liberal order has weakened this argument. Constructivists focus on the question of whether China's international identity and the norms it promotes are compatible with or threatening to the norms of the existing liberal order.

The theoretical debate about China's rise has both empirical and normative dimensions. Empirically, the key questions are: How much has China's relative power increased? How revisionist is China's foreign policy — does it seek to fundamentally transform the international order or merely to assert a larger role within it? Are the trends toward confrontation reversible through diplomatic engagement and institutional accommodation, or are structural forces of power transition making some form of conflict increasingly likely? Normatively, the key questions concern the terms of any future accommodation: Is a world in which China and the United States share global leadership compatible with the maintenance of liberal values and institutions? What would a genuinely multipolar world order look like, and what theoretical frameworks are best equipped to understand and help manage it? Allison's [56] Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides's Trap? provides the most widely read popular account of the power transition problem, while Ikenberry's [20] more nuanced analysis of the conditions for peaceful accommodation provides the most sophisticated liberal response.

10.3 Climate Change, Pandemics, and Human Security

The most fundamental theoretical challenge to mainstream IR in the twenty-first century may be posed not by the return of great power competition but by the emergence of truly global threats — climate change, pandemics, biodiversity loss, and technological risks — that cannot be addressed through the state-centric framework of traditional IR theory and that require forms of collective action that transcend the competitive logic of the anarchic international system. Climate change in particular poses a challenge to IR theory that is qualitative rather than merely quantitative: unlike traditional security threats (which can be addressed by strong states acquiring military capabilities and deterring or defeating challengers), climate change is a collective action problem of unprecedented scale and complexity that requires the sustained cooperation of virtually all states and non-state actors over a time horizon extending well beyond the planning horizons of democratic governments.

The politics of the UNFCCC process — from the Kyoto Protocol (1997) to the Paris Agreement (2015) and its subsequent implementation — has engaged all of the major IR theoretical traditions in debate about the conditions under which effective international cooperation on climate change is possible and the role of different actors, institutions, and strategies in achieving it. Neoliberal institutionalists have focused on the design of effective climate governance institutions and the challenge of maintaining cooperation among states with very different interests and capabilities. Constructivists have analysed the role of scientific knowledge, normative entrepreneurship, and the social construction of climate change as a security threat in shaping the international response. Critical theorists and post-colonial scholars have emphasised the justice dimensions of climate change — the fact that the states and peoples most vulnerable to climate impacts (in the Global South and among the poorest populations of every country) have contributed least to cumulative greenhouse gas emissions — and have challenged the adequacy of market-based mitigation approaches that perpetuate the economic structures responsible for the problem.

> *"The discipline of International Relations was built for a world of state competition, territorial boundaries, and military threats. The twenty-first century confronts us with challenges that are inherently transnational, cumulative, and civilisational in their consequences. Rethinking IR for this world is not an academic exercise but a political and moral imperative. — Synthesised from Buzan and Hansen [57] and Held and McGrew [54]"*

The COVID-19 pandemic — which demonstrated with devastating clarity both the depth of global interdependence (a novel pathogen originating in a single city could within months disable the global economy and overwhelm health systems on every continent) and the inadequacy of existing global governance arrangements for managing global health crises — has reinvigorated the debate about the scope and limits of state-centric IR theory. The pandemic revealed the persistent primacy of national governments in crisis response, but also the inadequacy of purely national responses and the critical importance of international cooperation, information sharing, and equitable access to vaccines and treatments. The role of the World Health Organisation, the COVAX mechanism, and the broader

system of global health governance in managing the pandemic has provided a rich natural experiment in the conditions for effective global collective action that IR theory is only beginning to process.

11. Conclusion

This paper has traced the changing perspectives in International Relations theory from the discipline's founding moment in the aftermath of the First World War to the complex, contested, and theoretically pluralist field that it is today. The journey from inter-war idealism through classical realism, liberal institutionalism, neorealism, neoliberal institutionalism, constructivism, and the successive waves of critical, post-structural, feminist, and post-colonial challenges represents not merely the intellectual history of an academic discipline but a continuous engagement with the most fundamental questions of political life: how power operates in the world, how cooperation is possible, what counts as security, who belongs to the community of moral concern, and how the present international order can be understood and potentially transformed.

The first conclusion is that the development of IR theory has been a genuinely cumulative process, even if the cumulation has taken the form of successive paradigmatic challenges rather than smooth progressive refinement. Classical realism's insight into the role of power and the structural constraints of anarchy remains indispensable, even if Waltz's neorealist formalisation of that insight overreached in its structural determinism and neglect of unit-level and ideational factors. Liberal institutionalism's demonstration that cooperation is possible under anarchy and that international institutions play an important role in facilitating it is empirically robust and theoretically important, even if it underestimates the distributional conflicts and power asymmetries that constrain the scope and effectiveness of international cooperation. Constructivism's insight that the structure of international politics is social — constituted by shared norms, ideas, and identities rather than purely material capabilities — has transformed the discipline's understanding of state behaviour, the origins of state interests, and the mechanisms of international change, even if constructivism's empirical research programme has not always lived up to the theoretical ambitions of its founding texts.

The second conclusion is that the critical, feminist, post-colonial, and post-structural challenges to mainstream IR have permanently transformed the theoretical boundaries of the discipline in ways that cannot and should not be reversed. The feminist demonstration that IR's core concepts are gendered and that women's experiences of international politics have been systematically marginalised has changed what IR scholars study, how they study it, and what they count as theoretically significant. The post-colonial challenge to IR's Eurocentrism has exposed the parochial character of what presented itself as universal theory and has created the conditions for a genuinely global IR that incorporates the perspectives and knowledges of the entire world. The post-structural critique of IR's positivist epistemology has made the discipline more reflexive about the power-knowledge relationships embedded in its theoretical frameworks and more attentive to the political consequences of the representations it produces. These are permanent gains that the discipline should build on rather than retreat from.

The third conclusion concerns the theoretical challenges of the twenty-first century. The return of great power competition, the fragmentation of the liberal international order, the climate crisis, global pandemics, and the digital revolution pose theoretical challenges that none of the existing IR traditions is fully equipped to address on its own, and that require the kind of theoretical pluralism, methodological creativity, and political engagement that the discipline is only beginning to develop. No single theoretical perspective — however sophisticated — can capture the full complexity of world politics in the twenty-first century, and the most productive theoretical agenda for the discipline is one that draws creatively and critically on the diverse theoretical traditions examined in this paper rather than seeking to reduce them to a single dominant paradigm.

The final conclusion is that the study of changing perspectives in IR theory is itself a form of political literacy. Students who understand why realism, liberalism, constructivism, and critical theories see the world differently are better equipped to recognise the theoretical assumptions embedded in policy discourse, to resist the ideological capture of foreign policy analysis, and to contribute to the development of the more just, more peaceful, and more sustainable international order that the most important challenges of the twenty-first century demand. The discipline's theoretical diversity is not a weakness to be overcome but a resource to be cultivated in the service of more adequate understanding and more thoughtful action in the world.

References

References are numbered sequentially in order of first citation. In-text citations appear as bracketed numbers. Formatting follows APA 7th edition conventions.

1. Wilson, W. (1918, January 8). Fourteen points address [Speech transcript]. U.S. Congress. https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/address-congress-fourteen-points
2. Angell, N. (1910). The great illusion: A study of the relation of military power to national advantage. Heinemann.
3. Zimmern, A. (1936). The league of nations and the rule of law, 1918-1935. Macmillan.
4. Woolf, L. S. (1916). International government: Two reports prepared for the Fabian Research Department. Allen and Unwin.
5. Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace. Knopf.
6. Niebuhr, R. (1932). Moral man and immoral society: A study in ethics and politics. Charles Scribner's Sons.
7. Carr, E. H. (1939). The twenty years' crisis, 1919-1939: An introduction to the study of international relations. Macmillan.
8. Waltz, K. N. (1979). Theory of international politics. Addison-Wesley.
9. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). The tragedy of great power politics. W. W. Norton.
10. Keohane, R. O. (1984). After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy. Princeton University Press.
11. Axelrod, R. (1984). The evolution of cooperation. Basic Books.
12. Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (1977). Power and interdependence: World politics in transition. Little, Brown.
13. Kant, I. (1991). Perpetual peace: A philosophical sketch (H. B. Nisbet, Trans.). In H. Reiss (Ed.), Kant: Political writings (pp. 93-130). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1795)
14. Doyle, M. W. (1983). Kant, liberal legacies, and foreign affairs. Philosophy and Public Affairs, 12(3), 205-235.
15. Russett, B., & Oneal, J. R. (2001). Triangulating peace: Democracy, interdependence, and international organizations. W. W. Norton.
16. Cobden, R. (1878). The political writings of Richard Cobden (2 vols.). Cassell, Petter, Galpin.
17. Mitrany, D. (1943). A working peace system: An argument for the functional development of international organization. Royal Institute of International Affairs.
18. Haas, E. B. (1958). The uniting of Europe: Political, social, and economic forces, 1950-1957. Stanford University Press.
19. Krasner, S. D. (Ed.). (1983). International regimes. Cornell University Press.
20. Ikenberry, G. J. (2011). Liberal leviathan: The origins, crisis, and transformation of the American world order. Princeton University Press.

21. Ruggie, J. G. (1998). Constructing the world polity: Essays on international institutionalization. Routledge.

22. Onuf, N. G. (1989). World of our making: Rules and rule in social theory and international relations. University of South Carolina Press.

23. Kratochwil, F. V. (1989). Rules, norms, and decisions: On the conditions of practical and legal reasoning in international relations and domestic affairs. Cambridge University Press.

24. Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391-425.

25. Wendt, A. (1999). Social theory of international politics. Cambridge University Press.

26. Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. International Organization, 52(4), 887-917.

27. Katzenstein, P. J. (Ed.). (1996). The culture of national security: Norms and identity in world politics. Columbia University Press.

28. Risse, T., Ropp, S. C., & Sikkink, K. (Eds.). (1999). The power of human rights: International norms and domestic change. Cambridge University Press.

29. Barnett, M., & Finnemore, M. (2004). Rules for the world: International organizations in global politics. Cornell University Press.

30. Lenin, V. I. (1916). Imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism: A popular outline. Petrograd.

31. Frank, A. G. (1967). Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical studies of Chile and Brazil. Monthly Review Press.

32. Cox, R. W. (1981). Social forces, states and world orders: Beyond international relations theory. Millennium: Journal of International Studies, 10(2), 126-155.

33. Cox, R. W. (1987). Production, power, and world order: Social forces in the making of history. Columbia University Press.

34. Gill, S. (Ed.). (1993). Gramsci, historical materialism and international relations. Cambridge University Press.

35. Wallerstein, I. (1974-1989). The modern world-system (3 vols.). Academic Press.

36. Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). Pantheon Books.

37. Der Derian, J., & Shapiro, M. J. (Eds.). (1989). International/intertextual relations: Postmodern readings of world politics. Lexington Books.

38. Walker, R. B. J. (1993). Inside/outside: International relations as political theory. Cambridge University Press.

39. Buzan, B. (1991). People, states and fear: An agenda for international security studies in the post-Cold War era (2nd ed.). Harvester Wheatsheaf.

40. United Nations Development Programme. (1994). Human development report 1994: New dimensions of human security. Oxford University Press.

41. Buzan, B., Waever, O., & de Wilde, J. (1998). Security: A new framework for analysis. Lynne Rienner.

42. Enloe, C. (1989). Bananas, beaches and bases: Making feminist sense of international politics. University of California Press.

43. Tickner, J. A. (1992). Gender in international relations: Feminist perspectives on achieving global security. Columbia University Press.

44. Enloe, C. (1993). The morning after: Sexual politics at the end of the Cold War. University of California Press.

45. Young, I. M. (2003). The logic of masculinist protection: Reflections on the current security state. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 29(1), 1-25.

46. Peterson, V. S. (Ed.). (1992). Gendered states: Feminist (re)visions of international relations theory. Lynne Rienner.

47. Fanon, F. (1963). The wretched of the earth (C. Farrington, Trans.). Grove Press. (Original work published 1961)

48. Said, E. W. (1978). Orientalism. Pantheon Books.

49. Doty, R. L. (1996). Imperial encounters: The politics of representation in North-South relations. University of Minnesota Press.

50. Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (Eds.). (2010). Non-western international relations theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia. Routledge.

51. Zhao, T. (2009). A political world philosophy in terms of all-under-heaven (Tian-xia). Diogenes, 56(1), 5-18.

52. Acharya, A. (2014). The end of American world order. Polity Press.

53. Fukuyama, F. (1992). The end of history and the last man. Free Press.

54. Held, D., & McGrew, A. (Eds.). (2002). Governing globalization: Power, authority and global governance. Polity Press.

55. Organski, A. F. K. (1958). World politics. Knopf.

56. Allison, G. (2017). Destined for war: Can America and China escape Thucydides's trap? Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

57. Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2009). The evolution of international security studies. Cambridge University Press.

58. Bull, H. (1977). The anarchical society: A study of order in world politics. Columbia University Press.

59. Wight, M. (1977). Systems of states (H. Bull, Ed.). Leicester University Press.

60. Dunne, T., Kurki, M., & Smith, S. (Eds.). (2016). International relations theories: Discipline and diversity (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.